to page 3 in the sections identified as "Monthly recurring 2 and non-recurring." Does this document show the pricing 3 offer from BellSouth in October of 2005? MS. MAYS: Mr. Chairman --5 Α I'm not certain. MS. MAYS: -- if I could, in order to fully answer 6 7 the question, we believe the witness will have to discuss the entirety of this offer. Just so that it is clear, this 8 9 is not and never was a stand-alone line sharing offer. 10 is --11 MR. WATKINS: Mr. Chairman, the -- the fact that 12 she wants to discuss has already been discussed before you. 13 And, frankly, Covad doesn't have a strong objection to it. 14 And that is what those rates may or may not have been tied 15 to. MS. MAYS: It's confidential commercial 16 17 negotiations. MR. WATKINS: Counsel for BellSouth was the first 18 19 one to state those in the open forum. MS. MAYS: It was in answer to --20 CHAIRMAN WISE: Ms. Mays, I -- I just -- I don't 21 see how I can sustain your objection. I -- you know, I 22 think we're -- we're treading carefully. We're not -- we're 23 not going into items that should not be disclosed. 24

we all understand that in negotiations it's a total package

1

and it's per company. And I think that's -- that's recognized.

MS. MAYS: We just want to make sure the record very clearly reflects --

CHAIRMAN WISE: We'd already heard on the --

MS. MAYS: -- it's a total package.

CHAIRMAN WISE: -- the Publix-Safeway concept, you know, so we got that.

## BY MR. WATKINS:

Q Subject to those objections, Mr. Williams, do you still remember the question?

A I think. But I -- I believe this is a comparison that was put together in 2004, as best I recall. And the rates we're talking about here that we were considering were relevant at the time because the SEEMs penalties were our primary concern. We were concerned because SEEMs penalties at that time were thought to be 5 million or \$6 million a year, and we would like very much to enter into a commercial line sharing deal to eliminate the SEEMs penalties. So the price was almost secondary at that point in time. So I -- I believe that this was put together in 2004.

Q Mr. Williams, are those the same prices that were originally offered in January of 2004?

A Well, if you look at the left-hand column, those are the original prices, yes.

Q Were those the prices that were on the table in
Cottober of 2005, tied or untied to other things?

A No, we had offered a different amount and -- and

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

- Covad had countered with these prices. But, no, this is not what we offered in 2005, as I recall.
  - Q So would you put the date on this in late 2004?
- A I believe it was during 2004. I'm not sure exactly when that would be. I would not say it was late in 2004, because late in 2004 I don't believe we were negotiating.
- Q If you could direct your attention to page 1 under "Qwest/Covad," the first box. You would agree that this chart was created after the Qwest/Covad agreement was signed; is that correct?
  - A Yes, that's probably right.
- Q And you would agree that the Qwest/Covad agreement was signed in October 2 of 2004?
- A Right. That -- that's what this indicates. And as I recall, we never presented these prices to Covad that's in this middle column.
- Q Okay. So you would agree with me that the price from January of 2004 until at least October of 2004 was the same price?
- MS. MAYS: I would object.
- 25 A No, I would not agree with that. We made an

1	offer, and there was a Covad counter, and we were far apart.
2	COMMISSIONER BAKER: So when the offer was
3	rejected, it was not preserved?
4	THE WITNESS: That's correct. It was off the
5	table.
6	MR. JONES: Mr. Chairman, may I approach the
7	witness with the next exhibit?
8	CHAIRMAN WISE: Yes.
9	MR. WATKINS: Mr. Chairman, this is also a trade
10	secret document, and we would ask that it be treated as
11	such.
12	(The document referred to was marked for
13	identification as TRADE SECRET
14	Covad Exhibit Number 3.)
15	BY MR. WATKINS:
16	Q Mr. Williams, have you had an opportunity to look
17	at this document?
18	A Yes, I have.
19	Q Does this refresh your recollection as to the
20	rates being offered in January of 2004?
21	A Right, that's consistent with the rates that we
22	offered in January to Covad.
23	Q The document that's marked as Covad 2, which is
24	this chart, the first column is identified as "BellSouth
25	offer": is that right?

1 A That's right.

5

6

7

8

9

13

15

16

17

21

- Q And you would agree that the rates contained in that column are the same rates attached to this January 30, 2004 letter?
  - A That's correct. But these -- this offer was not accepted.
    - Q In the far left-hand column of the -- Exhibit A to this January 30, 2004 letter, under SME, is that TWU?
      - A I'm sorry, what -- what am I looking at, now?
- Q Exhibit A to the January 30 letter. Is that TWU under SME?
- 12 A Yes, it is.
  - Q That's subject matter expert?
- 14 A That's right.
  - Q All right. And to your knowledge, were these rates the pricing offer from BellSouth at each point in the negotiations until Thursday last week?
- A No. No, we -- we had another offer.
- 19 Q Do you recall any variation from these particular 20 prices, without getting into specifics?
  - A Yes. What we offered before was -- was different than -- than these prices.
- Q And you're saying in October of 2004 or October of 2005?
- 25 A I'm saying in 2005, and I believe it was May, we

1	proposed another line sharing price that was a comprehensive
2	agreement involving other services.
3	Q Well, is the price for the line sharing portion of
4	that agreement different than these rates?
5	A I believe it was. My recollection is it was.
6	MR. WATKINS: I think that's all I have for you,
7	Mr. Williams.
8	Mr. Chairman, I'd move Covad's 1 through 3 into
9	evidence. Oh, 1 is collective 1 are all those rate
10	sheets.
11	MS. MAYS: This is 1?
12	MR. WATKINS: Yeah, collectively.
13	MS. MAYS: This is 2?
14	MR. WATKINS: 2 is the chart, 3 is the letter.
15	Subject to trade secret protection and and designation.
16	CHAIRMAN WISE: All right.
17	(The documents, heretofore marked as
18	TRADE SECRET Covad Exhibits 1, 2
19	and 3, were received in evidence.)
20	MS. MAYS: All I was going to do, Mr. Chairman,
21	was move for Mr. Williams' testimony exhibits to go into the
22	record.
23	CHAIRMAN WISE: Thank you.
24	(The document, heretofore marked as
25	BellSouth Exhibit Number 2, was

1	received in evidence.)
2	MS. MAYS: And also ask if Mr. Williams could be
3	excused.
4	CHAIRMAN WISE: He may. Thank you.
5	(Witness excused.)
6	CHAIRMAN WISE: Mr. Watkins?
7	MR. WATKINS: Are we up to Mr. Weber?
8	Mr. Weber, can you raise your right hand.
9	Whereupon,
10	WILLIAM H. WEBER
11	appeared as a witness herein, and having been first duly
12	sworn, was examined and testified as follows:
13	DIRECT EXAMINATION
14	BY MR. WATKINS:
15	Q Can you state your name for the record?
16	A William H. Weber.
17	Q Could you state your address for the record.
18	A 1230 Peachtree Street Northeast, Suite 1900, with
19	Covad Communications.
20	Q Did you cause to be filed in this docket 16 copies
21	of four pages of direct testimony?
22	A I did.
23	Q Did you cause to be filed in this docket 16 copies
24	of a single exhibit attached to that testimony?
25	A I did.

MR. WATKINS: Subject to cross, Mr. Chairman, Covad would move -- excuse me, CompSouth --I'm not sure who I am right now. CompSouth or Covad would move Mr. Weber's testimony into evidence, as well as his -- the attached exhibit. CHAIRMAN WISE: They will be. (Whereupon, the prefiled testimony of Mr. Weber follows:) 

```
THE REPORTER: How are we marking the exhibit?
 1
               MR. WATKINS: I believe it was Exhibit A. Covad
 2
    Exhibit A. Is it 4? You want to just be consistent? Covad
 3
     4. And it is not trade secret.
 4
                         (The document referred to was marked for
 5
 6
                              identification as Covad Exhibit
 7
                              Number 4 and received in evidence.)
               THE WITNESS: And, Mr. Watkins, would you care for
 8
    me to give a --
 9
               MR. WATKINS: Yes.
10
    BY MR. WATKINS:
11
12
          0
               Mr. Weber, do you have a summary?
               CHAIRMAN WISE: You know, your last cross must
13
    have gone so well, I guess you're flustered.
14
15
               MR. WATKINS: I'm -- one would think.
16
               THE WITNESS: Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, my
17
     testimony's only four pages, so my summary can't be that
     large. But I did want to --
18
               CHAIRMAN WISE: You must not have that much
19
20
     experience here then.
21
               (Laughter.)
               THE WITNESS: Sir, what -- what my testimony does,
22
     it sets -- sets out the methodology that Covad used.
23
24
               CHAIRMAN WISE: Hang on. Mr. Watkins, did you
     swear your witness?
25
```

MR. WATKINS: Yes, sir, I did.

CHAIRMAN WISE: Okay, thank you. I'm sorry.

THE WITNESS: That's all right, sir.

It sets out the methodology that Covad used to determine what we believe are just and reasonable rates for the various elements associated with line sharing. And so that involves taking a look at both recurring and non-recurring costs. And as you all know, the way those things are determined is somewhat different. So I'll address briefly what we did with non -- I'm sorry, with recurring costs first.

As Mr. Williams alluded to during his testimony, we have closed commercial line sharing agreements with Qwest, with Verizon, and with the new AT&T, previously SBC when we closed that agreement. So we do have extensive experience across a nationwide footprint with negotiating these deals.

And, again, as Mr. Williams points out in his testimony, his direct testimony, the rates for line sharing contained within those agreements are between 4.75 and \$7. So the rate that we set involves -- that we are suggesting involves two elements. Because that's the way line sharing works. You have a splitter, so that the loop, as it comes into the central office, goes to a splitter. In the BellSouth region, BellSouth owns the splitters that are used

for line sharing.

And from there, that piece of equipment does exactly what it sounds like it ought to do, it splits the signal into a high frequency and a low frequency portion of the loop. The high frequency portion then comes to Covad's collocation space, while the low frequency portion which is carrying the voice signal goes to the BellSouth switch.

So when you're talking about the high frequency portion of the loop, you really have two elements. You have the HFPL, and there's a recurring cost for that; and you also have a recurring cost for the port on the splitter because that is a cost that BellSouth incurs. So when you look at our rate sheet, we proposed a rate for both of those which adds up to about \$5 a month for the high frequency portion of the loop, including the splitter cost.

Just so you get a sense of how this compares in Georgia, currently today in Georgia we pay 61 cents a month for the -- what we proposed a \$5 cost for as a market-based rate. To a degree that's a little bit artificial, because in Georgia you all determined, with great wisdom, I might add, that the splitter cost should be recovered on a recurring basis as part of the loop cost, so we pay zero per month on for splitters here.

If you look region wide, though, and we could get exact numbers for you -- but if you look region wide, we pay

about 2.50 a month, region wide, for a combined price for the splitter port from BellSouth plus the high frequency portion of the loop. So the market-based rate we've proposed is approximately double what we pay region wide.

Now on the non-recurring side of things, as you all know, non-recurring costs are calculated in a much more straight-forward fashion than recurring costs because we don't have all these network elements. We have time and motion studies and we figure out what it actually costs BellSouth to do these things and we come up with a non-recurring cost.

So what we did for this, on almost virtually every element on there -- there's one that deviates from this and I'll explain that briefly in a second -- is we took the average non-zero rate in every state in the BellSouth region where Covad does business. We're in seven of the states, we are not in South Carolina or Mississippi. And we took an average.

And I say non-zero, because there are certain things such as load coil removal which, for instance in Georgia, we pay zero for load coil removal on the theory that a forward-looking network wouldn't have load coils, so we shouldn't be charged for them. In reality, not under a TELRIC model, BellSouth does incur costs to remove load coils for us when we ask them to, so we included a rate in

the rate sheet for that, and we arrived at that by averaging every non-zero rate in the seven states in the BellSouth region in which we do business. The assumption there is that what you've got with that average is the wisdom of seven sets of staff, seven sets of commissioners who have examined time and motion studies repeatedly, and that that's a reasonable proxy for what the actual cost to BellSouth is for the non-recurring rate.

Finally, in the one area we did not do that, we did not average it, that was on bridge tap removal, which you'll see on my Exhibit A -- well, it's on there, bridge tap removal. It's the second line down under loop modification. That's because we have a number -- several zero states there and then we have one outlying state, Tennessee, where the charge is \$528 and we just wound up with a really wacky number there. If you look at that number, we proposed \$68.11 and BellSouth proposed on Tommy Williams' revised exhibit, which I do not believe is confidential or trade secret, proposed a \$92.00 rate. So we're not that far apart on that one, despite the fact that our methodology on that one did deviate a little bit.

That's my summary.

MR. WATKINS: Mr. Chairman, I'd tender Mr. Weber for cross examination.

CHAIRMAN WISE: For the Commission?

1	MR. WALSH: No cross, Mr. Chairman.
2	CHAIRMAN WISE: Thank you. CUC.
3	MS. MELLINGER: No questions, Mr. Chairman.
4	CHAIRMAN WISE: BellSouth.
5	MS. MAYS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Commissioners.
6	Good afternoon, Mr. Weber.
7	THE WITNESS: Ms. Mays.
8	CROSS EXAMINATION
9	BY MS. MAYS:
10	Q Just to be clear, Mr. Weber, if for some reason
11	Covad is wrong and some court somewhere says we don't have a
12	271 obligation, you would agree with me that BellSouth has
13	no obligation to negotiate a line sharing agreement,
14	wouldn't you?
15	A Are we talking about a global agreement or just in
16	Georgia?
17	Q Let's limit it to Georgia. Let's say we got the
18	highest possible court says no 271 obligation in Georgia,
19	would you agree with me that in Georgia, Covad has no I'm
20	sorry BellSouth has no obligation to get a line sharing
21	agreement with Covad.
22	A And I just want to state this clearly, so I make
23	sure I'm saying what I want to say instead of just yes or
24	no.

In the event that it is determined that the

Georgia Commission does not have authority to set -- to examine and set 271 rates, you would not be under an obligation to provide line sharing; that is correct. If it were found to be not a checklist item.

- Q Now in understanding your proposals, you did explain I think in your summary that you looked at the non-recurring and the recurring rates differently, right?
  - A Correct.

- Q And for non-recurring rates and the averages you present, those are based on TELRIC rates in those states and in the circumstances --
- A I disagree with that. Non-recurring rates do not include a forward looking TELRIC component in the same way that recurring rates do. The TELRIC component of rate setting is primarily involved in network type issues. Non-recurring rates, on the other hand, are based on actual costs that are incurred by BellSouth. What is the hourly rate that you pay to your workers within the central office? How long does it take them to remove a loop from this jumper and put it onto this jumper? So those are not forward looking rates.
- Q Did you look at BellSouth's submissions, cost studies in TELRIC proceedings for those states, sir?
- A I have looked at those in the past. I did not look at them again with regard to this proceeding.

1	Q And you did not limit your analysis to solely
2	Georgia, correct? You looked at six other states in
3	addition to Georgia.
4	A I created an average, as I said, of the non-
5	recurring rates from the states in which Covad does business
6	in the southeast in the BellSouth region.
7	Q With respect to the recurring rates, you didn't
8	take an average of the recurring rates you've already agreed
9	to pay to other carriers, did you?
LO	A No, we did not do that.
L1	Q And isn't it true that, for example, with your
L2	line sharing agreement with SBC and now AT&T, the monthly
L3	recurring rate is \$5.75?
L <b>4</b>	A That's correct.
۱5	Q And when you talked in your summary about "about
L6	\$5.00," you rounded up, didn't you? In fact, the line
17	sharing proposal is \$4.50, correct?
18	A No, that's not correct.
19	Q The recurring line sharing rate, if you add the
20	splitter and the high frequency portion of the loop, would
21	you not add \$1.22 to the \$3.28?
22	A Correct I'm sorry, you are correct. I did not

And I would like to add on that note that we

believe we have a reasonable basis for the recurring rates

mean to round up, you're correct.

23

24

we've suggested here, but we do also believe if the Commission chose to look at -- particularly if it did it with a weighted average -- the rates that we are paying across the other 38 -- I'm sorry, the other 28 states where we do business, in the commercial agreements that we've entered into there, we think that that would be a potentially valid methodology. It's not what we chose to do here, but if that's what the Commission chose to do, we think that would be a very reasonable position to take.

- Q And in fact, the monthly recurring rates that you have agreed to pay Qwest and Verizon are also higher than the \$4.50 you've proposed in your testimony, is that right?
- A That's correct. With the exception that the Qwest-- depending on our volumes, the Qwest rate can be at that level. Based on our current volumes today, however, that is not what we are paying.
- Q And you use the line sharing arrangement you obtained from BellSouth to offer your own DSL service to both residential and small business customers, is that right?
  - A That's correct.

- Q And that was what you're paying 61 cents a month for now, correct?
  - A That's correct.
    - Q Is it correct that your lowest residential DSL

offering is \$39.95?

A I don't believe today that Covad offers direct residential DSL service on a line sharing basis. I could be wrong about that. If it is, it's a product that we don't advertise. I'm sorry -- our line sharing products are offered -- I'm unwilling after what you asked me to say exclusively, but almost exclusively -- via wholesale partners such as Earthlink, AOL and AT&T. So they certainly have offers selling our wholesale product that are much lower than that.

Q If I were to look at your website and I saw \$39.95 residential, is it your testimony you do not use BellSouth's line sharing arrangement to offer that?

A No, that's not my testimony. If you see that on the website, then I'm sure that that's accurate.

Q Is it also correct that in your most recent financial reporting, you reported a weighted average revenue per user for broadband customers of \$54.00 a month?

A That's correct. And of course, that includes our T1 customers, our medium and small -- residential, small, medium and large business customers.

Q Would you agree with me, Mr. Weber, that under the current line sharing transitional plan that the FCC established, that the rate under that plan in Georgia, the 75 percent of the unbundled copper loop rate, that that rate

-	would be \$0.27.
2	A That's correct.
3	MS. MAYS: Thank you. I have nothing further.
4	CHAIRMAN WISE: Covad.
5	MR. WATKINS: We have no redirect, Mr. Chairman.
6	CHAIRMAN WISE: Do you want to move your testimony
7	in, or your exhibit?
8	MR. WATKINS: I did before, but I'll move again
9	Mr. Weber's testimony and exhibit be entered into evidence.
10	(Witness excused.)
11	CHAIRMAN WISE: Competitive Carriers, your
12	witness. Are you going to put Mr. Gillan up this evening?
13	MR. MAGNESS: Mr. Chairman, actually we were
14	hoping to put up the witness that we had subpoenaed first,
15	because we asked for that witness primarily to complete the
16	discovery that we had asked for. We wanted to be able to
17	put that witness up before Mr. Gillan.
18	Given that there are two discovery requests that
19	that witness is to address, one of them is subject to this
20	review of the redacted material that we talked about earlies
21	·
22	CHAIRMAN WISE: Right.
23	MR. MAGNESS: we could put up the witness as
24	far as the discussion of Data Request Number 1, I think we
25	have everything we need to do that. I would just prefer to

do that and receive all --

- 2 CHAIRMAN WISE: If there's no objection, we'll go forward.
  - MR. MAGNESS: Okay. And if we could -- I don't know if it's the same witness or not, but we could recall the witness tomorrow for the rest.
  - MS. FOSHEE: Mr. Chairman, we would prefer that Ms. Tipton just be on the stand one time, and since Mr. Gillan is here, we would ask that we just go ahead and try to finish Mr. Gillan tonight and then put Ms. Tipton up tomorrow, so she can testify once.
  - CHAIRMAN WISE: I can't see why it would hurt to put up Mr. Gillan tonight.
  - MR. MAGNESS: Mr. Chairman, the only thing is that if there is information we find out from examining the witnesses based on the discovery that BellSouth has provided, that would inform Mr. Gillan's testimony. It's just like any other discovery request, you get a response back and that discovery response may inform the direct case you put on.
  - CHAIRMAN WISE: Will Ms. Tipton be available tomorrow, Ms. Foshee?
  - MS. FOSHEE: Yes, she will be, but you know, I would object to using this hearing process as a discovery mechanism. I mean certainly they could have issued a

subpoena for her deposition prior to the hearing and, you know, we certainly had some objections to that, but that doesn't mean that it wouldn't have been resolved in their favor, as the subpoena was. So to just put her on the stand to conduct discovery so that Mr. Gillan can then testify about that tomorrow seems to put us at somewhat of a disadvantage.

CHAIRMAN WISE: I believe it does as well, Mr. Magness.

MR. MAGNESS: Well, Your Honor, number one, the only reason we have this problem is that there were documents redacted from the discovery responses and we don't know why, and we don't know whether that was appropriate or not. So allowing BellSouth to get an advantage of that from that, we don't think is really fair.

CHAIRMAN WISE: I just can't see giving you two bites at the apple, Mr. Magness. I hear your point, but --

MR. MAGNESS: I guess what we're saying is that there's two different apples. And we're happy to take on the first apple where we have all the data in front of us and we know what we're facing. The second one, where we're still awaiting the review of the documents, that's the one we're concerned about.

I don't want to put Ms. Tipton on once and not be able to ask her about those documents that may be made part

```
of discovery after the review, so we can put Mr. Gillan on.
 1
 2
               CHAIRMAN WISE: Well, Mr. Magness, my advice is
 3
     that you put Mr. Gillan up.
 4
               MR. MAGNESS: Okay, we'll do that.
 5
               COMMISSIONER BAKER: Could we just find out, has
     staff completed its review of the --
 6
 7
               CHAIRMAN WISE: Mr. Walsh, thank you very much.
               (Discussion off the record.)
 8
 9
               CHAIRMAN WISE: We'll take five minutes.
10
               (A short recess was taken.)
11
               CHAIRMAN WISE: All right, thank y'all very much.
     Mr. Magness.
12
13
               MR. MAGNESS: Mr. Chairman, I think on the break,
    we've cut through this. We, CompSouth, is willing to
14
15
    withdraw the motion to compel that necessitated the staff
    review of the documents that were redacted. We are willing
16
17
     to take BellSouth's witness this evening, or this afternoon
18
     rather, based on the information we have available.
19
    think that's going to be sufficient for the purposes of the
    hearing, and we'll go forward that way.
20
               CHAIRMAN WISE: Well, great. Thank you for that
21
     resolution.
22
23
               MS. FOSHEE:
                            In response to the subpoena,
    BellSouth calls Ms. Pam Tipton.
24
```

And Mr. Chairman, because she is here as a witness

for CompSouth, she did not prepare a summary, but she'll be available for cross examination.

CHAIRMAN WISE: All right, thank you.

MR. MAGNESS: Mr. Chairman, CompSouth would request the ability to treat Ms. Tipton as a hostile witness; that is, allowing us to do leading questions, given that she is an opposition witness.

MS. FOSHEE: She will no doubt be hostile.

(Laughter.)

MR. MAGNESS: Nothing personal, Your Honor, just a technical term.

CHAIRMAN WISE: You may.

MR. MAGNESS: And Commissioners, there are some trade secret documents that were produced in response to discovery request 1 and 2, which Mr. Jones is providing only to counsel, the Commissioners, the court reporter. As with the documents discussed earlier in the hearing, we'll make every effort to avoid saying any numbers or names that would reveal the trade secret information.

And while Mr. Jones is passing this out, I'd just like to say for the record the subpoena that was issued was for a BellSouth corporate representative who could provide information responsive to CompSouth's second request, Data Requests Number 1 and 2.

Ms. Tipton, would you please raise your right

hand? 1 Whereupon, 2 PAM TIPTON 3 4 appeared as a witness herein and, having been first duly sworn, was examined and testified as follows: 5 CROSS EXAMINATION 6 7 BY MR. MAGNESS: For the record, could you please state your name 8 9 and how you're employed? 10 Α Yes, my name is Pam Tipton and I'm employed by BellSouth Telecommunications. 11 12 0 And Ms. Tipton, I believe -- correct me if I'm wrong -- you have been identified by BellSouth as the 13 witness responsive to the subpoena that was issued to 14 BellSouth for information on Data Request Number 1 and 2? 15 That's correct. А 16 And I'd ask you to look at the documents I've put 17 Q in front of you, and as I noted before, these are designated 18 confidential and so I don't want you to tell me much about 19 them, but if you could just look at the three documents that 20 we handed out. Are you familiar with each one of these 21 documents? 22 Yes, I am. 23 Α Do you know whether or not they were produced as 24 0

part of BellSouth's responses to Data Requests Number 1 and

2 from CompSouth?

7

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

17

22

23

- A Yes, they were.
- Q Okay. And I'd like to start with this
  spreadsheet, the title of which is "Signed Commercial
  Agreements, Georgia Information Only". Do you have that
  before you?
- 7 A Yes.
  - Q Okay. And if I'm in this room and there is a spreadsheet, I suppose I have to talk to you about it.
- 10 A Seems that's the case.
  - Q We've done this before. But not on this spreadsheet.
    - The first question I have is on the far right column, the far right two columns, there is a -- the last column in this spreadsheet says "Total DSO Local Voice Platform Service, First Month Agreement in Effect." Do you see that?
- 18 A Yes.
- Q And then there are numbers in some of the columns following after that. Are the lines that are reflected in those numbers UNE-P lines?
  - A Yes, that would have been the in-service count of UNE-P the month that the commercial agreement was actually executed.
- Q And then the column immediately to the left,